

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

STEVE DAVIS,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

THE LIVING TRUST OF MICHAEL  
J. FITZGERALD, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:12-cv-01939-JCM-NJK

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
SUSPEND ALL ACTIONS**

(Docket No. 46)

Pending before the Court is the Plaintiff's Motion to Suspend All Actions, which the Court construes as a motion to stay. Docket No. 46 ("Mot."). Defendants filed responses. Docket Nos. 48, 49. Plaintiff did not file a reply.<sup>1</sup> The Court finds the matter properly resolved without oral argument. Local Rule 78-2. For the reasons discussed below, the Court hereby DENIES the motion.

The pending motion appears to seek a stay of this case pending an alleged criminal investigation. *See* Mot. at 1-2. As an initial matter, the motion is DENIED because Plaintiff failed to file points and authorities in support of the motion. *See* Local Rule 7-2(d) ("The failure of a moving party to file points and authorities in support of the motion shall constitute a consent to the denial of the motion.") Even if the Court considers the motion on the merits, however, the motion would be denied because Plaintiff fails to provide persuasive reason that the case should be stayed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: July 8, 2013

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
NANCY J. KOPPE  
United States Magistrate Judge

<sup>1</sup> Defendants' responses were filed on June 4, 2013 and June 6, 2013. *See* Docket Nos. 48, 49. Any reply was due 7 days after service of the responses. *See* Local Rule 7-2(c).